

corporations to move overseas? Why would we agree to an agreement that would displace peasant farmers who would be forced to migrate to the United States?

The American public aren't fooled. Campaign finance reform hasn't stopped the incredible financial influence of multinational corporations. These corporations are weighing in with the candidates, even Citibank. Take, for example, the provisions hidden in the Peru FTA. As Senator Edwards points out, "Buried deep in the 800-page text of the Peru FTA are ambiguous provisions that could allow U.S. banks to demand compensation if Peru reverses its disastrous social security privatization."

The Peru FTA contains provisions that could allow Citibank to demand compensation in FTA foreign investor protection tribunals from the Peruvian Government if Peru seeks to reverse its failed social security privatization. The Peruvian archbishop and both labor federation presidents asked the Ways and Means leaders to fix this problem. And it hasn't been fixed.

The House floor will be voting on this in a couple of weeks. As a Democratic Party, we have stood united against privatization of Social Security. We have not backed down. That is why it shocks me to hear that Senator OBAMA supports the Peru FTA. Yes, Senator OBAMA does support the Peru FTA.

Senator Edwards has it right. It is time to stick up for the American workers. It is time to reject the same NAFTA model that has devastated our industry. It is time to listen to the broad list of groups who do not support the Peru FTA. Not one union, environmental, consumer, small business, faith, family farm group supports the modified Bush Peru NAFTA Expansion FTA. So why would any Presidential candidate?

It is important to hear what the candidates are saying about protecting our jobs and fighting for fair trade deals. It is important that we stick together in this fight to keep our jobs here at home. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the Peru FTA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HARE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE PERU TRADE DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Peru trade deal will also be bad for U.S. agriculture and all farmers in our country and, amazingly, in Peru. So both here at home and abroad it will result in more harm.

Let's look at the facts. This current trade deficit chart with Peru tells us we are already in the red with Peru, as we are in the red with China and in the red with Mexico and in the red with almost every other trading country, Japan, et cetera. The U.S. vegetable trade deficit with Peru is already a part of this. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service, just the vegetable deficit component is already over \$200 million in 2006. So America's vegetable farmers will lose more market share. They have already lost market share, especially those who farm asparagus, onions and peas. Their situation will be similar to the plight of America's tomato, bell pepper and cucumber farmers who learned well what happened after NAFTA was signed. They all lost production as it relocated.

Several global corporations have already indicated what they are going to do. They are already putting their processing plants in Peru. Green Giant has done it. Del Monte has done it. The pattern is the same, the same as under NAFTA. As was the case with Mexico where millions of peasant farmers were upended under NAFTA with no adjustment provisions for them, Peru's farmers will also be hurt when these same global corporations take over their farming operations and flood their markets with rice, corn and chicken.

We expect that an additional 3 million Peruvian agricultural workers will be directly affected and millions of Peruvian farmers, as Mexico's farmers well know, will be upended. This will force increased migration of those individuals to cities that are already swelling with large numbers of poor, and it is projected expanded illegal drug production as people try to stay in their home countries with no crops to sell, they turn to those illegal choices.

Similar to the lack of protection for Mexico's corn and bean farmers under NAFTA, which that corn and bean tariff is going to phase out at the end of this year, and another 2 million of Mexico's farmers will be hurt, we know that what happens is that they either emigrate to adjoining cities or to the United States, many of them illegally, or they turn to the illegal sector where they literally risk their lives in order to survive.

What kind of a plan is this that would treat the people of developing countries with such derision? What kind of a plan is it that would hurt our farmers to that extent? Why does it always have to be a negative? Why can't trade be a plus plus? Importantly, Peru was the world's top coca producer in 1996, and coca production remains a viable alternative for farmers forced to give up their legal crops.

Is anybody listening? Is anybody thinking? It is pretty clear what is going to happen because there is nothing in the agreement to help Peru adjust. We saw what happened when that didn't occur under NAFTA. There were no adjustment provisions for Mexico's

farmers. CAFTA, the same thing, and now we add Peru on top of the pile. There is nothing in the Peruvian agreement for adjustments inside of Peru. The displaced farmers have few options. If they do not turn to coca production or other illegal industries, they will be forced to move. And we can ask where. To the overcrowded cities of Peru, further straining those resources? To another country? With the debate raging about illegal immigration and with us unable to reach a civil accommodation across this continent, wouldn't it be truly cruelly irresponsible to support another trade agreement that could result in more devastation to small holders?

Shouldn't we be helping these farmers adjust inside their own homelands? That is long overdue inside of Mexico, in order to help people earn money in their own countries, rather than wipe out hundreds of thousands of people as if their lives and their cultures didn't matter. And then we get the added problem of illegal labor trafficking into this country, which we can't control.

The Peru agreement doesn't do anything to address these serious human concerns. It does have some of the glossy language like NAFTA and CAFTA did that ends up toothless in terms of enforcement.

Madam Speaker, why would the American people be given more of the same out of this Congress? We ought to be changing these trade agreements to development agreements and treating people with the respect they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PERU FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Tonight I rise to address the House and the American people regarding the U.S. Peru Free Trade Agreement and its effect on working families. But before I launch into my remarks, I want to be clear. I am committed to trade. I believe trade is an essential component to the development and strengthening of our economy.